

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

**BALTIMORE DIVISION**

JASON ALFORD, DANIEL LOPER, WILLIS  
McGAHEE, MICHAEL McKENZIE, JAMIZE  
OLAWALE, ALEX PARSONS, ERIC SMITH,  
CHARLES SIMS, JOEY THOMAS, and LANCE  
ZENO, Individually and on Behalf of All Others  
Similarly Situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

THE NFL PLAYER DISABILITY & SURVIVOR  
BENEFIT PLAN; THE NFL PLAYER  
DISABILITY & NEUROCOGNITIVE BENEFIT  
PLAN; THE BERT BELL/PETE ROZELLE NFL  
PLAYER RETIREMENT PLAN; THE  
DISABILITY BOARD OF THE NFL PLAYER  
DISABILITY & NEUROCOGNITIVE BENEFIT  
PLAN; LARRY FERAZANI; JACOB FRANK;  
BELINDA LERNER; SAM McCULLUM;  
ROBERT SMITH; HOBY BRENNER; and  
ROGER GOODELL,

Defendants.

**Case No. 1:23-cv-00358-JRR**

**PLAINTIFFS' CONSENT MOTION FOR LEAVE TO  
EXCEED PAGE LIMITATION OF REPLY MEMORANDUM  
IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION**

Pursuant to Local Rule 105.3, Plaintiffs respectfully request leave to exceed the page limitation for their forthcoming reply memorandum in support of their motion for class certification (ECF No. 102) by fifteen additional pages. In support thereof, Plaintiffs state as follows:

1. Pursuant to the Order entered by the Court on March 4, 2025 (ECF No. 161), Plaintiffs must file their reply papers in support of their motion for class certification no later than

April 11, 2025.

2. As revised effective July 1, 2023, Local Rule 105.3 provides that “[u]nless otherwise ordered by the Court, memoranda in support of a motion or in opposition thereto and trial briefs shall not exceed thirty (30) pages, and reply memoranda shall not exceed fifteen (15) pages, inclusive of footnotes but exclusive of (a) affidavits and exhibits, (b) tables of contents and citations, and (c) addenda containing statutes, rules, regulations, and similar material.”

3. Plaintiffs need this expansion of the page limits for two reasons. First, Plaintiffs need to address the numerous arguments set forth in Defendants’ oversize (40-page) memorandum in opposition to their class certification motion (ECF No. 111).

4. Second, in addition to replying to that 40-page opposition memorandum, Plaintiffs intend to file a motion, pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence (“FRE”) 702, to exclude the opinions of Defendants’ putative expert, David B. Lasater, Ph.D., which are set forth in his declaration, filed as part of Defendants’ class certification opposition papers (ECF No. 111-2).

5. Rather than burden the Court with two separate memoranda and because Plaintiffs’ arguments in their intended FRE 702 motion are interrelated with their class certification reply arguments, Plaintiffs believe that it would be more efficient and practical to present their arguments in a single memorandum, whose length would be substantially less than the number of pages allowed under Local Rule 105.3 were Plaintiffs to file two separate memoranda, one in reply as to their class certification motion and the other in support of their FRE 702 motion.

6. Accordingly, given the need to address Defendants’ numerous arguments in their 40-page opposition memorandum and the need to present their FRE 702 arguments, Plaintiffs respectfully request the Court’s leave to exceed the limitation on length set forth in Local Rule 105.3, and that it permit Plaintiffs to file a combined reply memorandum and memorandum in

support of their FRE 702 motion that shall not exceed 30 pages.

7. On April 4, 2025, counsel for Defendants informed counsel for Plaintiffs that Defendants do not oppose this requested relief.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court grant them leave to file a combined reply memorandum in support of their class certification motion and memorandum in support of their forthcoming FRE 702 motion of up to 30 pages. A proposed Order accompanies this motion.

Dated: April 4, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

**SEEGER WEISS LLP**

By: s/ Benjamin R. Barnett  
Benjamin R. Barnett  
**SEEGER WEISS LLP**  
325 Chestnut Street, Suite 917  
Philadelphia, PA 19106  
Telephone: (215) 553-7980  
bbarnett@seegerweiss.com

*Counsel for Plaintiffs and for the  
Proposed Class and Subclasses*

Christopher A. Seeger (*admitted pro hac vice*)  
Diogenes P. Kekatos (*admitted pro hac vice*)  
Caleb A. Seeley (*admitted pro hac vice*)  
Hillary R. Fidler (*admitted pro hac vice*)  
**SEEGER WEISS LLP**  
55 Challenger Road, 6th Floor  
Ridgefield Park, NJ 07660  
Telephone: (973) 639-9100  
cseeger@seegerweiss.com  
dkekatos@seegerweiss.com  
cseeley@seegerweiss.com  
hfidler@seegerweiss.com

Samuel L. Katz (*admitted pro hac vice*)  
Julia M. Damron (*admitted pro hac vice*)

**ATHLAW LLP**

8383 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 800  
Beverly Hills, CA 90211  
Telephone: (818) 454-3652  
samkatz@athlawllp.com  
julia@athlawllp.com

Bryan F. Aylstock (*admitted pro hac vice*)  
Justin G. Witkin (*admitted pro hac vice*)  
Douglass A. Kreis (*admitted pro hac vice*)  
D. Nicole Guntner (*admitted pro hac vice*)  
Bobby J. Bradford (*admitted pro hac vice*)

**AYLSTOCK, WITKIN, KREIS, & OVERHOLTZ, PLLC**

17 E. Main Street, Suite 200  
Pensacola, FL 32502  
Telephone: (850) 202-1010  
BAylstock@awkolaw.com  
JWitkin@awkolaw.com  
DKreis@awkolaw.com  
NGuntner@awkolaw.com  
BBradford@awkolaw.com

***Counsel for Plaintiffs and for the  
Proposed Class and Subclasses***

Jason S. Rathod  
Nicholas A. Migliaccio  
**MIGLIACCIO & RATHOD LLP**  
412 H Street, N.E.  
Washington, DC 20002  
Telephone: (202) 470-3520  
jrathod@classlawdc.com  
nmigliaccio@classlawdc.com

***Counsel for Plaintiffs and Liaison Counsel  
for the Proposed Class and Subclasses***

Robert K. Scott (*admitted pro hac vice*)  
Gerry H. Goldsholle (*admitted pro hac vice*)  
**ADVOCATE LAW GROUP P.C.**  
2330 Marinship Way, Suite 260  
Sausalito, CA 94965  
Telephone: (949) 753-4950  
bob@advocatelawgroup.com  
gerry@advocatelawgroup.com

*Additional Counsel for Plaintiffs*